

REMARKS

In view of the preceding amendments and the comments below, the Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application.

Referring to the section of the office action entitled Drawings, Figures 1-5 have been amended on drawing sheets 1-4 to include the legend --PRIOR ART-- as suggested.

Referring to the section of the office action entitled Claim Objections, Claim 1 introduces in line 2 the side surface element and then makes specific reference to that element in line 4. The applicant is unable to find any ambiguity in Claim 1 which requires correction. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the objection.

New apparatus claims 13-18 have been added which depend directly or indirectly from independent apparatus claim 1. Claim 13 is supported by the description on page 8, line 11. Claims 14 and 15 are supported by the description on page 8, lines 16-18. Claim 16 is supported by the description on page 6, lines 8-9, and page 10, lines 24-26. Claim 17 is supported by the description bridging pages 10 and 11, and claim 18 is supported by the description on page 8, line 10.

In the office action, claims 1-7 and 10-12 were rejected as being anticipated by Fujii.

Referring to Claims 1, 10, 11 and 12, the Examiner contends that a substrate (13, column 1, line 32) of Fujii can be considered as an optical transceiver module. It is unclear which substrate the Examiner is referring to in Fujii. The substrate described in column 1, line 32 of Fujii and shown in Figures 1 and 2 appears to have been mistakenly referenced as substrate 13 instead of substrate 12. Since the Examiner has already referred to a planar substrate 12, it is assumed for purpose of this response that the Examiner is referring to the reflecting case 13 attached to the upper surface of the substrate 12. Thus, the Examiner's contention appears to be that the reflecting case 13 of Fujii can be considered as an optical transceiver module according to claim 1, 10, 11 or 12. A transceiver is a well known term referring to a device which is both a transmitter and a receiver. A medium which is capable of propagating or reflecting a transmitted or received signal is neither a

transmitter nor a receiver. The reflecting case 13 whose function is to reflect light from the light sources 17 is also neither a transmitter nor a receiver. Accordingly, the reflecting case 13 cannot be considered as an optical transceiver module. Since the Fujii reference relied upon by the Examiner does not disclose all of the feature of claims 1, 10, 11 and 12, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection under 35 USC 102 is incorrect. Claim 1, 10, 11 and 12 are therefore novel. Furthermore, Fujii does not teach or suggest an arrangement using anything other than a display device. Therefore, it would not be obvious for a skilled person to replace the display device with an optical transceiver module.

Referring to claims 2, 10 and 12, the Examiner asserts that Fujii discloses a circuit board including an end portion defining a recess (20). The feature 20 is defined in the description and shown in the Figures of Fujii as a through-hole. A through-hole is a form of aperture. Apertures and through-holes are not recesses. Therefore, Fujii does not disclose a recess in the planar circuit board as recited in claims 2, 10 and 12. The Examiner's rejection under 35 USC 102 of claims 2, 10 and 12 is therefore incorrect, and claims 2, 10 and 12 are novel.

Referring to claims 3, 11 and 12, the Examiner asserts that Fujii discloses an optical transceiver module (13) with electrical terminals. The reflecting case 13 in Fujii does not include any electrical terminals. Therefore, the Examiner's assertion under 35 USC 102 is considered incorrect. Accordingly, claims 3, 11 and 12 are novel over Fujii.

Referring to claim 6, the Examiner asserts that Fujii discloses an optical transceiver module (13) soldered onto the planar substrate. There is no disclosure in Fujii of the reflecting case 13 being soldered onto the substrate 12. Therefore, the Examiner's assertion under 35 USC 102 is considered incorrect. Accordingly, claim 6 is novel over Fujii.

The application is considered in a suitable condition for allowance and favourable consideration of the amended claims is requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES INC.

By: 

Ian Hardcastle
Reg. No. 34,075

Agilent Technologies Inc.
Legal Department, DL 429
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 7599
Loveland, Colorado 80537-0599

Dated: March 4, 2002

Tel.: 650 485-3015